UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes, *Editor in Chief*

Associate Editors

Francis Neilson Louis L. Mann Curtis W. Reese

Rome—In Mexico and America

The Mexican War and the Present Crisis

By EDWIN D. MEAD

Mexican Notes

By SYDNEY STRONG

The Story of My Experiments with Truth

Part II. Chapter XIX. By M. K. GANDHI

Ineligible to Naturalization

By DOREMUS SCUDDER

VOLUME XCVIII NUMBER 21

Chicago, January 24, 1927

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

Subscription, $3.00 per Annum

(Established 1878)

A JOURNAL *of the* RELIGION *of* DEMOCRACY

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, EDITOR IN CHIEF

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

FRANCIS NEILSON LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

UNITY Fellowship

FRANK C. DOAN
CHARLES F. DOLE
ZONA GALE
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
H. R. MUSSEY
FRANCIS NEILSON
EDMUND H. REEMAN
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Managing Editor
EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

ROBERT COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
HENRY LL. JOHNS, Janesville. C. W. WENDTE, Cincinnati.
J. C. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.00. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCIS L. ROBBINS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. SUNDERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
GEO. W. COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

W. Waldemar W. Argow
Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Percy M. Dawson
James Waldo Fawcett
David Starr Jordan
George Saranton
Anna Garlin Spencer
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—F. M. Matthéeff
CANADA—Sidney Snow
CHINA—Gilbert Reid
ENGLAND—Fred Hankinson
Walter Walsh
FRANCE—G. Demartial
Romain Rolland
GERMANY—Theodor Hahn
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
ITALY—Guglielmo Lusidi
JAPAN—Nobuichiro Imaoha
RUSSIA—Alina Huebach

UNITY PUBLISHING Co., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

Announcement

Part II

OF GANDHI'S AUTOBIOGRAPHY

began in this magazine on

September 20th

GANDHI'S RETURN TO INDIA
HIS LAW PRACTISE
BEGINNING OF HIS PUBLIC CAREER
and
THE GREAT STORY OF SOUTH AFRICA

Subscribe Now! *Renew Now!*

UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY
700 Oakwood Boulevard
Chicago, Illinois

Dear Sirs: Enclosed please find $3.00, for which
(a) Enter my subscription for one year from date,
or
(b) Renew my subscription for one year from date of expiration.

Name .....

Address .....

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page

Notes 323
Rome—In Mexico and America—M..... 325
Jottings.—J. H. H..... 326
Editorial Correspondence: Mexican Notes—SYDNEY STRONG..... 327

ARTICLES—

The Mexican War and the Present Crisis—EDWIN D. MEAD..... 329
The Story of My Experiments with Truth—Part II, Chapter XIX—M. K. GANDHI..... 332
Ineligible to Naturalization—DOREMUS SCUDDER 333

POETRY—

The Price of Peace—HENRY S. SALT..... 323
Cor Cordis—DOMBEY SHEPHERD..... 328

CORRESPONDENCE—

Conscription of Wealth—ALICE STONE BLACKWELL 334
A Tribute from a Generous Friend—MORGAN BARNES 334
Double Appreciation—VIOLET MCNAUGHTON.. 334
UNITY a "Bracer"—M. A. BRATTLAND..... 334

THE FIELD—

A Calendar of World Heroes..... 335
Abraham Lincoln Centre Friday Morning Forum 336
Concerning the American Committee for Fair Play in China..... 336

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOLUME XCVIII MONDAY, JANUARY 24, 1927 NUMBER 21

THE PRICE OF PEACE

What know ye, then, of Peace, who mock her name,
Brand her as craven, haggle at her "price,"
And vaunt war's courage o'er her cowardice,
As though to sheathe, not draw the sword, were shame?
That listless, drowsy thing ye thus defame
Is but a halting-place 'twixt war and war,
Not Peace. True Peace—blind scoffers that ye are—
Ye know not, dazed by glamour of war's flame.

Peace is no sickly substitute for strife,
But that pure element where strife must die;
The deep that feeds the springs of thoughtful life.
Her price? It soars all worldly wealth above.
Think not your dross from Hatred's mint shall buy
Her splendours; for the price of Peace is *Love*.

HENRY S. SALT.

What will be the situation in Nicaragua and Mexico when this editorial paragraph is printed, no man can say. Anything may happen! Meanwhile, however, the situation at this moment is what it is—American forces have moved into Nicaragua for reasons which change, like a railroad time-table, "without notice." The State Department says one thing one day and another thing another day, always carefully concealing the real facts. Why the government should make elaborate attempts at concealment, is difficult to imagine, for the real facts, as to this intervention are perfectly well-known to all intelligent persons over three years of age. But since the government chooses thus to bluff, let its bluff be called! That is just what certain of our contemporaries in the field of religious journalism have done—Editors and business managers of the *Christian Leader,* the *Christian Register,* the *Congregationalist,* and *Zion's Herald*, all published in Boston, united in telegraphing to President Coolidge, as follows:

Inasmuch as representatives of the religious journals of the country are debarred from White House newspaper conferences and you recently were reported as seeking better support for your foreign policy from the press of the country, we respectfully request that you send each of the editors of the religious journals of Boston answers to the following questions: What were the specific reasons for landing marines on the coast of Nicaragua? What interest have we in the so-called neutral zone established in that country by United States forces? Will you please name the Americans and American interests that have requested protection of the United States in Nicaragua? Will you favor submitting to an impartial court of arbitration any question now in dispute between our country and Mexico? We especially desire light upon the issues involved in the present Mexican and Nicaraguan situation about which there is confusion and criticism of the administration in church circles throughout the country.

Will the President or his Secretary of State tell these gentlemen, representative and responsible leaders of public opinion, what they want to know? There is about as much chance of this as the wolf telling the lamb the real reason for tearing his throat. The lamb is muddying the stream, etc., etc., etc.—Oh, yes, plenty of reasons! But the real reason, that the wolf likes blood and can devour lamb's flesh with great content and profit, will never be mentioned. If we go to war, it will be on the basis of the same kind of lies and deceptions that took us into the Great War in 1917. Will the people fall for it again! That is the one great question of the hour. Meanwhile, these editors have shown themselves alert.

A survey of recent events in the foreign affairs of the United States has led us to speculate on the question as to whether Secretary Kellogg is not the worst Secretary of State this country has ever had. We have had some pretty bad men in the foreign office, as we have most certainly had some most distinguished ones. But have we ever had any occupant quite so terrible as this man so appropriately dubbed by the newspaper correspondents, "nervous Nelly." Of course, any just man would be merciful as he looks at the State Department. Secretary Kellogg was never very bright any way. Then he went to England and, like Walter Hines Page before him, was spoiled by adulation, and came home with a head so big and swollen that his shoulders fairly bent under the strain. By this time he had become old, and feeble, and doddering. Then came illness to hasten the advance of senility. Surely, we should have mercy on this rather ridiculous and certainly very pitiful old political hack. And we *would* have, were it not for the fact that this man, like every public official, is not merely himself. He is the nation! He speaks for the nation, he acts for the nation—the lives as well as the honor of our citizens are in his keeping. We have no quarrel with Kellogg, the man. We are not enough interested in him even to have contempt for him. We are thinking only of our Sec-

retary of State, and the destinies of men and nations reposing in his hands. And from this standpoint we say that the great office of Jefferson, Webster, Marcy, Seward and Fish was never quite so completely disgraced by incompetency and foul purpose as it is today. Oh, the helplessness of the American people at such an hour as this. Officials whom they had no hand in selecting, and over whom they have no shadow of control, playing with their very lives like a group of crap-shooters playing with their dice in the darkness of some back-alley! The people are to blame for much—the election of Coolidge, for example—but they are not to blame for everything. Not by a long shot!

Is there a growing economic democracy in America? The opening of the new year is a time of reckoning. Publicists, even statisticians differ. We hope the facts will come to light, and become indubitable in either the affirmative or the negative. For as goes the economic status of the people so goes democracy. Politics are for the most of the citizens a side-issue, when they do not serve as a bitter jest. The fathers strenuously wrought out a political democracy. They did well. Perhaps they did the best they knew or could. Doubtless economic autocracies and aristocracies had not arisen to plague them, and to snap profane fingers at their sacred political institutions. It is no blindness to history which prompts thoughtful citizens of today to reckon the economic problem our greatest social issue. It may not have been that in the days of the fathers. But one must be blind not to measure its bulk in today's society. And we do not even know accurately where we are going, or in what precise direction we are tending. Many are sure that we are heading for disaster in the pyramiding private fortunes with which modern industrial organization endows the few. The alarm which these would spread is quieted by that group of publicists who point to the constantly widening participation of the workers in industrial stock-holding, in the mounting totals of savings bank deposits, in the rise of opulent labor banks, in the unprecedented standards of wages which prevail in certain industries, in the increased volume of retail business fostered by the millions of the consuming public. They enlist statisticians to justify their enthusiasm. But statistics is more a comparative or relative science than an absolute. How do the totals of small stock holdings compare with the totals of large-block holdings? Are the workers gaining on irresponsible capitalists in the total control of capital? Does the present economic system promise real democracy at an early date, or even remotely? These more fundamental questions the common man appeals to embattled hosts of publicists and statisticians to answer.

In the second volume of the "Intimate Papers of Colonel House" (page 319), there appears a statement by the Colonel which has a profound bearing upon the whole question of the relation between the United States and the Allied Powers in the Great War. This particular statement was set down in the famous diary on September 25, 1916, and sprang out of the bitter controversy then raging with England over violations of neutrality laws. In spite of the ten years that have passed, the statement still remains true, and is extraordinarily pertinent to the present debt situation. Says Colonel House:

> Page (the American ambassador in London) thought good relations might have been brought about with Great Britain had we acted differently. This irritated me, and I told of the number of ways in which the United States had shown friendship, and partiality for the Allies, only to find our relations worse now than at the beginning of the war. I ventured the opinion if we sent Bernstorff home and entered the war, we would be applauded for a few weeks, and then they would demand money. If the money was forthcoming, they would be satisfied for a period, but later would demand an unlimited number of men. If we did it all, they would finally accuse us of trying to force them to give better terms to Germany than were warranted.

To which should be added, now that the war is over, that having done everything, we are now blamed by the Allies for not canceling the debts incurred in a war for which we were not responsible, and which without us would have been lost! "House's prognostications," says Professor Seymour, the editor of his papers, "were to be justified with curious correctness during the course of the next two years." We should say so! For "two years," and then straight on for ten! From the beginning there has been no pleasing the Allies. Convinced that they were innocent victims of Germany's malevolence, they have acted, and are still acting, like spoiled children, for whom nothing is too good, and whom nothing satisfies. It is this psychology of injured innocence that makes so important the discovery that the Allied Powers were equally guilty with Germany for the war. Rub that home, and it may be possible to live with these nations without being insulted daily for the good that we have done them!

In a statement published in the newspapers of the country shortly after New Year's, a hundred clergymen united in the declaration that "in spite of their shortcomings, they (the Christian churches) have been instrumental in bringing about a civilization which today is the best the world has ever known." This is a characteristically complacent Christian statement. Look at the calm assertion that the churches "have been instrumental in bringing about" the best civilization the world has ever

known! Was their instrumentality shown in fighting every scientific discovery, blocking and hindering every forward step in knowledge, imprisoning, torturing, killing every seeker after truth they could lay their hands on? Or was this instrumentality demonstrated in resisting such great reforms as the Revolution in France, the Reform Bill in England, the abolition of chattel slavery in America, the emancipation of women everywhere? Or was it to be found, perhaps, in their enthusiastic support of the Great War in all its horror, brutality and wholesale destructiveness? "Instrumental," indeed. If the world has progressed, it is quite as much in spite of the churches as because of them. But *has* it progressed? *Is* our present day civilization "the best the world has ever known"? This isn't saying much, we grant you; on the contrary, it's saying pitiably, damnably little. On such basis of comparison, it's nothing to boast of, so far as we can see. But even so, is it true? Much more to the point, much more accurate, certainly much more wholesome and helpful, is the statement of Professor Nathaniel Schmidt, of Cornell, as given to the New York Ethical Culture Society on this very day that the proclamation of the one hundred clergymen was published to the world.

> In view of devastating wars between nations and sinister preparations for still more terrible wars, a social system that allows multitudes of men to perish in misery and starvation while enormous wealth is concentrated in private hands, and a deadening formalism and sectarianism in religion, there is need of a prophetic voice that humanity will recognize as coming from its inmost self.

Here speaks the true voice of religion!

We have never been a fanatic on the question of smoking. We do not smoke ourselves, but we have never seen any reason why others should not smoke if they so desired. The smoking problem seems to be a thousand leagues removed from the drinking problem, and any alleged connection between the two, from the standpoint of reform, essentially illogical. But smoking has its serious side all the same. As a pastime, a recreation, a comfort, like a cup of tea—it is one thing; but as a drug, an opiate, a poison-habit—it is something else again. What worries us today is the growing dependence of men—and women!—on this fragrant weed, the apparent inability of millions to live even for a few moments without it. We have all become familiar, of course, with the man who has to smoke his cigarette between the courses of a meal. Equally familiar is the man who has to light his cigar or cigarette before the train reaches the station—he can't wait the few moments before the train comes to a standstill! But more serious cases are now appearing. We note the man who comes into the wash-room of the sleeping car in the early morning, and before he washes his teeth and hands must "light up," and carefully lays his cigarette down and picks it up again as he goes through the various items of his toilet. This summer we have seen an increasing number of men carrying cigarettes and matches as they went on to the beach in their bathing suits. One man in the bath house, after stripping himself stark naked, we saw light a cigarette and carry it with vigorous puffs under the shower! This may be laughable—undoubtedly it is. But it is also serious, for what we are producing here is another habit-forming drug. To lose one's freedom, one's self-control—to be a slave to anything—is to forfeit one's manhood, to become to some degree an animal. Imagine, if you can, the late Charles William Eliot being obliged to "get a puff" before he washed his face!

Rome—in Mexico and in America

I

The American-Roman hierarchy is in poor business when it undertakes to champion the cause of the much beset Roman hierarchies in Latin American lands. These degenerate cults should be much beset. To defend them is to defend the indefensible. Our Roman prelates in the United States have a full-sized job in their own domain without taking on the rest of the Americas. Only at the instigation of Romanists in the United States did the late outbreak against the Government of Mexico by the clerical party get the foreign support which afforded it strength and a semblance of respectability. Now the Roman hierarchy in Nicaragua is seeking aid from the same source. In the minds of many Americans it is a count against the Diaz program in Nicaragua that this hierarchy is in alliance with him. On numerous counts the Romanist propaganda arouses suspicion and antagonism among liberal-minded citizens. The evils of nationalism are bitter enough,—its jingoism, its intolerance, its vaunted claims for the "chosen people," the favored nation. But the evils of sectarianism as embodied in the Roman system is worse still, if such a thing be possible —worse in the sense that they cover a greater area and wreak a wider damage. A system which in the name of religion ramifies populations here and there in all parts of the world, cleaving them into groups which exalt their partisanship above all other spiritual and political considerations, is a menace to every wholesome social ideal. A nation composed of puppets who can only demand: "My country right or wrong," is noble compared with

an international group of religionists who substitute "My church right or wrong." When such a coalition demands or even suggests that Catholic adherents in the United States shall sponsor the Latin American Roman hierarchies in their present policies and practices, and throughout their unsavory history, the menace to everything which religion and good citizenship should stand for is manifest.

II

Not the least revolting feature of the appeal to American Romanists in support of Mexican and Nicaraguan Romanism is its assumed medium of prayer. The various proclamations and manifestoes from the Mexican and Nicaraguan hierarchies are calls to prayer. Roman Catholic adherents in the United States must pray increasingly that their reactionary programs shall prevail. This is the cult of a tribal deity. Scarcely, indeed, can it claim that dignity. It is rather the apotheosis of party, of sect, of priestly caste. There is no suggestion of yielding issues to the dispensations of an all-wise and unfailingly beneficent Supernal Power. It is utilizing religious prejudice in the support of political shifts. Of course it is bringing the rite of prayer into disrepute. It is lining up God with a party. It is an attempt to force Deity to yield to the will of a group. It is not the aspiration of the saint to know and do the will of an omniscient and unflinchingly just and truthful Deity. There remain too many who invoke the offices of prayer to violate or re-direct the laws of the material universe for private ends. And there is much enjoyment of the subjective and mystical fruits of praying. But it surely is too late in the age of political enlightenment to employ these offices in the interests of political propaganda. It is bad enough to conduct a campaign among enlightened Americans in behalf of what the Roman church does and stands for in Mexico and Nicaragua. To couch this propaganda in a call to prayer to the God of all men and all nations is several degrees worse. If parties are bent upon fighting political battles, they should at least observe the rules of the conflict. It is a kind of sniping, it is hitting below the belt, it is demagogy, to enlist the sanctions and prejudices of religious rites in such a contest. No wonder religion suffers so grievously among enlightened populations when hierarchies hoary with historic sanctions stoop to such devices.

It is commonly believed that oil and water will not mix. Holy water appears to have developed unreckoned chemical properties. Wherever in the lands south of us American oil magnates clamor for "protection of American persons and American property" (around their oil wells), there arises a similarly insistent clamor for "religious freedom" (for the local Roman hierarchy). If these two propagandas have not actually mixed, they display a striking congeniality and disposition to push and pull as one team. American oil interests demanded a reversal of the land policy of the Mexican Government. Contemporaneously the Roman hierarchy in Mexico appealed to all good Catholics in the United States to "pray" frustration upon that Government for its policy in dealing with the church and church property. Later the American people awoke to the fact that the American Navy and its Marine Corps were being employed as the agents of predatory American commercial interests in Nicaragua. Contemporaneously, again, the Roman hierarchy in Nicaragua sends out its call to "prayer" among Romanists in the United States. This alliance of "religious freedom" with the powers that would be free to prey is provocative of thought. To pray and to prey involve a degree of vocal and auditory confusion; it has been commonly assumed that the spiritual distinction was more discernible. The grounds of the present anomalous alliance are still not altogether apparent. Presumably Mr. Doheny is a good Catholic and faithful to the church. Loyalty to him and his associates in the exploitation of Mexican oil resources cannot be the whole explanation. The association is on the surface accidental, no doubt. Only below the surface does the essential affinity appear. The passion to exploit inspires partnerships where they are otherwise unlikely. M.

Jottings

We print the following which has just come to our desk:

THE SOUTHERN SCHOOL OF DIVINITY
5459 Willis Street, Dallas, Texas, Office of the Registrar
Dear Sir and Brother:

If you have not yet completed your work for your B. D. or D. D. degree, and are interested in doing so through Extension Courses at moderate cost, it will be worth your while to fill out the enclosed post card asking for full particulars. You doubtless realize the added prestige, usefulness and power for good that comes to a degreed man.

Yours faithfully,
SOUTHERN SCHOOL OF DIVINITY,
W. H. Parrington, Registrar.

Yes, brother, "prestige, usefulness and power for good" are valuable possessions, but sometimes they come too high!

Judge James E. Gorman, of Philadelphia, thinks the Prohibition has brought about conditions of oppression in America "comparable to the oppression of Russia under the Czars." Hm! We wish that Judge Gorman had lived in Russia under the Czars.

Leonard Kip Rhinelander has recently been refused, by an appellate court in New York, an annulment of his marriage to Alice Jones. It is obvious that Rhinelander has gone to the wrong court. Let him take his money to Rome, and get what he wants.

We never read a statement or speech by Lloyd-George these days without being reminded of the old-time hymn, "Hark, from the tombs, a doleful sound." If any contemporary statesman is absolutely dead, publicly speaking, it is Lloyd-George. In the absence of character, he has fallen like a tree which has no roots.

The editorial management of the Encyclopedia Brittanica has consented to withdraw its picture of the Zionist flag in response to protests received from the anti-Zionist Palestine Arab Executive. With what petty matters men concern themselves! The smaller the issue, the deeper the feeling and the bitterer the fight. Why *not* a picture of the Zionist flag? Isn't this information which the Encyclopedia should give us?

Telephone service between New York and London is now open at $25 a minute. We venture to surmise that here is one line which will be used strictly for business, not for gossip. J. H. H.

Mexican Notes

[Editorial Correspondence]

"We have never lost a pin" This was a remark made to me by the director of the National Normal School, in Mexico City. In a visit to this school, with its 250 teachers—in preparation, and its 5,000 pupils, brought in from all parts of the city (co-educational) to furnish material for "practice," we had come to a large room, with forty sewing machines. They were, of course, a part of the machinery of instruction in the school. But I wished to know just how they were used. "The teachers use them in the forenoon, and the neighbor women come in the afternoon and use them." That seemed to be a remarkable bit of social work, coupled with correct pedagogy, and I asked, "How do the neighbors respect the machines?" The director lifted his hand with a smile; "We have never lost a pin." He also went on to say, that the future teachers went out into the neighborhood as nurses and in other social aspects. "And how are they received by the people?" "There has been only one case of objection."

For this and other social-educational experiments, I should advise any student to spend one year, at least, of his training in Mexico City. I am quite clear in this, although I have been here less than a week. I shall never forget an hour spent in the Indian School, this afternoon. It has been in operation only a year. Here we found 200 Indian boys, from twenty-six tribes and speaking as many languages. They come up to Mexico City from all over Mexico, the most of them not able to speak Spanish, and many of them coming without even the rudiments of civilization. You can imagine the task. They are to stay in this school for three years, and then go out fitted to mingle on an equality with the people that walk the streets of the city. As a matter of fact, they are expected to return to their homes, to become centers of modern culture for their people, especially in the rural schools. Never can I forget the scene in the auditorium of the school. First, on the big stage was enacted a tableau representing the effects of The Revolution. There were two groups, both clad in native costume, one gathered about a fire, the other uneasy and turning in their slumbers. Then came long and insistent bugle calls, when the sleepers shook off their slumbers, and awoke. Next, the nearly 200 boys were arranged on the stage, which was colorful, in red. They sang four choruses, the first was a folk-song about the "Four Corn-stalks"; the second, a "Love song"; the third, a popular air on "What is there to be?" while the last was the National Hymn of the Republic.

We then had the treat of listening to the Teacher of Music in the school. He is one of the most celebrated musicians of Mexico—Prof. Ignacio Fernandez Esperon—all of which is a hint of the tremendous hold education is taking upon the Mexicans. Prof. Esperon is devoting himself—he is not only a beautiful singer, but a composer as well—to these 200 Indian boys. He and others are looking and working for a renascence of Indian culture, which may mean much to the general culture of mankind. I am telling you a little of what is probably the beginning of a very important chapter in the development of a culture that has its roots in an ancient civilization. Those interested in education should write the Department of Education, Mexico City; also ask for information concerning the Summer School of the University, which, last summer, was attended by nearly 400 students from the United States.

And the visit to the Department of Education this morning, where we spent two hours in an interview with Dr. J. M. Puig Casauranc, Minister of Education, and Dr. Mose Saenz, Under-Secretary, was full of surprises. (There were thirty of us, constituting Hubert C. Herring's Seminar, editors, preachers, authors, social workers, business men. lawyers, etc., calling ourselves rather a critical and fair-minded group, making a collective survey of affairs in Mexico, in order that we might obtain a more accurate view of conditions). In the corridors were many mural paintings by the celebrated Indian artist, Diego Rivera. They were nearly all on social themes and covered large spaces on the walls. I note some of the themes, "Union of the Worker and the Farmer," "Miners" and again "Miners," "Soldiers Guarding the School," "Group of Peasants at Study," etc. There were hundreds of these

paintings, which are sure to be famous; all by this Indian artist. When we came into the large anteroom of the minister's office I noted in the center of a beautiful table this inscription: "The Spirit shall speak for my race." And around the top border of the room were these names, and only these: Plato, Tolstoy, Dante, Pythagoras, Beethoven and Tagore.

The opening words of Dr. Casauranc were, "President Calles tells me to tell you the truth, that you may understand Mexico; that you may be able to tell the people of the United States. In education, President Calles has in mind the people of Mexico, who are several centuries back of the civilized life of the world." Dr. Saenz did most of the speaking, since he was equipped with a better command of English, although it was a running address, made by both of them. Here are some of the facts brought out: The Department faces great illiteracy, over eight millions being of the illiterate class, or 62% of the population; enrolled in the public schools are nearly two millions; eight per cent of the federal budget is spent on education; safe to say that five out of ten of school age go to school. In 1926 there were 2,721 rural schools, 1,000 having been organized in that year. Plans are on foot to organize 1,000 more during the year 1927. The department is specializing on rural schools. The department has the best broadcasting radio in the country, which is used for educational purpose. Receiving sets are in all the schools. It was a delight to see the literature put out by the department, monthly bulletins, magazines for the rural teachers, art magazines, Mexican Folk-ways, books on ethics, etc., etc., samples of which were on a huge table before us. On examination we found among them Tolstoy, Ethics (Hutchins' Berea College, Ky., book being translated into Spanish) and behold, The Four Gospels—which last mentioned book is distributed free throughout the schools of the land.

Someone asked if the Beatitudes would be permitted in the school: "Certainly, the Four Gospels are given to all the pupils!" There was free questioning, and no one withheld what was on his mind. I never saw a fairer exchange of ideas. Out of it I gleaned the following—only a part. "The morale of the rural teachers is fine. We demand good health, enthusiasm and devotion. The rural schools are the most important thing in Mexican education. For the rural schools even candles are provided for the adults to use in coming through the dark. The teachers act as nurses, letter-writers, social workers. Libraries are sent out to the rural schools. There are groups of experts who go from school to school and demonstrate cooking, nursing, home industries, agriculture. They hold institutes for three weeks to which come teachers from the villages roundabout. They train the teachers in actual school work. They even vaccinate and organize baseball clubs. In one district, 52 chiefs went with the traveling institute, taking care of the complete administration. The wages of teachers in rural schools is two pesos ($1) a day, for 365 days in the year. Of 8,000 teachers in the federal schools 4,000 are men. Men and women get the same wages."

As to "religious persecution" it was stated that not one Catholic school in Mexico City is closed. The government never killed anybody, not even injured anybody, in connection with the schools. It was the law, fifty years ago, that no religious teaching should be done in primary (first four years) schools. "There is no public school in Mexico where a word is said against religion." . . . . "The religious press is free." The government has no paper.

We visited the University, the Rector (President) Dr. Alfonso Pruneda and Dr. Manuel Barranco, the Secretary General, kindly giving us nearly two hours, chiefly filled with open questions. There are over 11,000 students. It is one of the best universities in the world, having been founded long before Harvard. In the room where we gathered, Professor John Dewey spoke when he was lecturing as exchange professor, a practice that the University of Mexico maintains, to a degree, with European and American universities. I have been struck how the name of John Dewey appears, nearly everywhere wherever we start in on a discussion of education. What an influence! When asked to describe the basic principles of the fine educational system the government is promoting (certainly to be put down to the credit of the present government) the reply comes: We are applying the principles of Dewey. It was the same when we were discussing the rural schools. We are attempting "to learn by doing"—"to socialize education." . . . There is no limitation to liberty in the University, we were told. There are 3,000 women students. The budget is 3,000,000 pesos ($1,500,000). There are many student groups which meet for purpose of discussion. There are many Catholic students.

I must not overlook our visit to the big store, which is a part of the educational system. It contained all sorts of handicraft, all by pupils: furniture, soap, pictures, book-binding, etc., etc. It looked like a big department store, with its spacious three floors. It is to encourage industrial work among the pupils, who get 25% of the selling price. . . . So, in this way and many other educational ways the present government is doing fine work for Mexico. They will tell you that the last Revolution—the one from 1910—differs from the preceding in magnifying education. I can quite believe it. In the educational movement—at which I have merely hinted—the present government is winning its way into the affections of the people and striking permanent roots for itself.

SYDNEY STRONG.

Cor Cordis

The battle is within,
The sword we use
Is wisdom born of all-compassionate love,
For this and this alone
Can slay each enemy.

DOMBEY SHEPHERD.

For UNITY.

The Mexican War and the Present Crisis

The President has ordered six additional war vessels with more than four thousand men to Nicaragua, to reinforce the forces we have already sent there, ostensibly to protect American lives and property. To many of us this great armada seems utterly incommensurate with any reported menace. Every patriotic man believes that our citizens everywhere should be properly protected in their legitimate international rights. But no American life has been threatened in Nicaragua, and nothing seems more unlikely than that a political faction there, manifestly most anxious for our favor and support, should sanction anything sure to provoke the hostility of so powerful a neighbor.

Senator Borah, chairman of the foreign relations committee of the Senate, has recently charged Washington politicians and American capitalists with large oil and mineral interests in Mexico with a systematic and persistent effort to involve the United States in a "shameless and cowardly war with Mexico." He believes, and other serious and patriotic men in Congress believe, that our intervention in Nicaragua, landing military forces there and taking sides with the minority Conservative Government, when Mexico had recognized the opposing Liberal Government, is in line with this menacing project. The project has been fortified by claims that Mexican forces with encouragement and support from the Mexican government, were being dispatched to Nicaragua to take a hand in the civil war there; and this scare has been aggravated by ridiculous allegations that the Liberals of Nicaragua and of Mexico are "Bolsheviks," inspired and even subsidized by Soviet Russia, and that their ultimate aim is to drive a Communist wedge between the United States and Panama. The men in Washington and New York who say these things do not believe them; it is their way of inflaming the popular psychology. The South American republics are not deceived for a moment and unhappily their newspapers have too easily seized upon the situation as new evidence of a widespread "imperialism" among the people of the United States, of which they themselves may ultimately become the victims. This view has been echoed in the capitals of Europe, where we have not too many friends, and even the London newspapers have said things which it is not pleasant for us to read. The responsibility for this harsh and widespread criticism is ours. We have allowed the mischief-makers rope which we should never have allowed them. "The American people," says Senator Borah plainly, "should understand that all this cry of communism and destruction of property is an effort to justify war with Mexico. They talk communism and bolshevism, but—what they mean is war."

It was before New Year's that Senator Borah said this. Things have in that time moved rapidly from bad to worse at Washington, but Senator Borah feels even more strongly that the course of the administration is mistaken. On January 7 he had an interview with the President, and when he came away he said that nothing had been said which changed his view. He felt that as concerns the rival governments in Nicaragua, we had taken the wrong side and Mexico the right side; that the claim of Diaz to the presidency is utterly illegal and that he maintains his place only by the influence of our State Department and our military support; and that in his judgment no American life or legitimate interest in Nicaragua is in danger. Coincident with this outspoken declaration by Senator Borah comes the cabled assurance from President Sacasa, of the Nicaraguan Liberal government that his party has no anti-American sentiment whatever and that every possible guarantee has been given for the protection of American life and property.

Both President Sacasa and President Diaz have just sent to the *New York Times* full statements in detail of their positions and of the history of the revolution as each views it. I do not hesitate to say that Sacasa's message has to me more the ring of truth than does his rival's. He is a graduate of Columbia University, and seems clearly to be the superior mind. Diaz, formerly a clerk in an American commercial establishment in Nicaragua, has much more the appearance of the adventurer, although upon such a matter one dare not be dogmatic. Senator Borah, who has for sixteen years been a close student of Nicaraguan politics, accepts Sacasa's version. President Coolidge, who has now sent a special message to Congress reviewing the situation, accepts Diaz's version. The significant thing in the President's message is his charge that the Mexican government is privy to the support of Sacasa's side to the extent of sanctioning supplies of arms and munitions. This is a serious charge, but is so fully accepted as to lead our government to sanction the supply of arms to Diaz.

There are those who remember the clash between the Dutch and the British in South Africa some years before the Boer war, culminating in the disastrous defeat of the British forces at Majuba. The cry rose all over England that no defeat of British arms could be accepted. Gladstone was then prime minister of England. The crisis prompted him to closer study of the situation, with the resulting conviction that the English position was mistaken and, through much immediate obloquy, he ordered conciliation and peace. It is the verdict of the best informed newspapers and of the most serious public opinion in the United States today that the position of our administration upon the Nicaraguan situation is a grave and mischievous blunder, pregnant if persisted in with disastrous consequences. If this becomes clear at Washington, has the administration the righteous courage of Gladstone for dealing with it, or will it indulge the foolish pride of a poor consistency?

The message from Sacasa has been followed by full statements by both Sacasa and Diaz, published in the newspapers during the last week, of their respective views of the Revolution, so that no necessary information is lacking. On Monday, President Coolidge sent his message to Congress defending the administration for its intervention in Nicaragua; but it can not be said that this gave any important new information. It did make the

grave charge that the Mexican government had brought about the present situation in Nicaragua and was continuing it, in hostility to our interests. This charge, supported by no recital of pertinent or sustaining facts, is a serious matter. It shows, what every sensible person already knew, that the administration's real quarrel was with Mexico; and the temper in which the Mexican foreign minister, Senor Saenz, in his statement published Tuesday, brands the charge as groundless, is a notable witness to the self-restraint and pacific purposes of the Mexican government. Our people, in the present inflamed state of the public mind, should seriously take to heart its solemn closing words: "If the American government, that has striven so much for international peace and for arbitration to settle the difficulties among nations, should turn its back upon its principles, trying to impose strength upon right, it would assume an attitude absolutely inexplicable."

The President's message was followed by Secretary Kellogg's amazing statements to the foreign relations committee of the Senate. His defense for our course is the presentation of a great pile of quotations from the propaganda utterances of communists in the United States, Mexico and South America, as well as Russia. These utterances are certainly often wild and foolish; but no more of them are credited to communists in Mexico than in the United States; and no reason is given for thinking they are approved by the Mexican government or by the Sacasa party in Nicaragua, which indeed expressly disclaim them. A more remarkable fulmination certainly never came from a responsible statesman in a grave crisis.

I believe that there is too much sobriety and common sense at Washington and in the country, too keen a sense of justice and the obligation of international neighborhood, too much decent respect for the opinions of mankind, to let this insanity go much farther. But none of us can forget that eighty years ago we did let a similar insanity go so far as finally to plunge us into a "shameless and cowardly war with Mexico," for which we blush today. If the history were repeated today, it would be for reasons still more paltry and more despicable than the reasons then. But do we want to let the republic in the year 2000 look back to 1927 as we now look back to 1846? It will be profitable for some to look back to that old "shameless and cowardly war with Mexico," as Senator Borah characterizes the possible war which our present firebrands are trying to foment, and consider it in cool blood.

A writer in the *Boston Herald* takes exception to that paper's denunciation of our war with Mexico in 1846 as "an inglorious war." A correspondent in the *New York World* writes to justify the Mexican War on general principles. In the long, hard struggle for the survival of the fittest, the incompetent and crude nations must give way to those that are rising, potential, and equal to the demands of the place and time. Mexico was not equal but cumbered the ground, and our conquest was in line with the nature of things.

The only fair criticism which can be of the *Herald's* stricture on the Mexican War is that it was too temperate. The war was not only inglorious, but infamous. The critical correspondent says that the war was provoked by Mexico, was "the inevitable outcome of an open policy of Mexican insolence and hostility, and under the circumstances entirely unavoidable." "The sole opposition to the war and annexation," he says, "came from the anti-slavery Whig politicians of the North"; and "misrepresentation of facts was the chief weapon of the anti-war party."

I must be pardoned for saying that this is nonsense; it bears no relation to the facts of history. I am acquainted, I think, with all important works upon the Mexican War, including the latest and most thorough history, by Professor Justin H. Smith, which places the Polk policy in the most favorable light possible and would make the war respectable if it could be made respectable. It is the completest history of the war that was ever written, or ever will be written; for the Mexican War recedes into ever smaller and smaller proportions beside the mighty wars that have followed. The history is a monument of learning and meticulous research, and Professor Smith is always scrupulously truthful as to events. As to political judgments, his are much better than some and, I think, worse than others—for example, Abraham Lincoln's. The Mexican War was but an episode, on the whole the most disgraceful episode, in the long struggle in the United States with slavery, which began with Jefferson's Ordinance of 1784 for the government of the Northwest Territory—defeated in Congress because of its prohibition of slavery in the states to be created from the territory—and ended with Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation. The plain people will not read Professor Smith's exhaustive volumes. All who are interested should read at least the chapters on the annexation of Texas and the Mexican War in Carl Schurz's life of Henry Clay, and Lincoln's speech on the war, in Congress at the time. No momentous new facts have come to light, nothing to change the complexion of things, since Lincoln spoke.

Lincoln's famous speech, in which he denounced President Polk's statements as to the causes and beginnings of the war, in his successive messages, as "the sheerest deception," was given on Jan. 12, 1848. On May 21, 1848, Lincoln wrote a letter to Rev. J. M. Peck, of Illinois, who had sent him a copy of a local newspaper, The Belleville *Advocate*, containing a report of an oration by Mr. Peck, at a celebration of the battle of Buena Vista. This almost forgotten letter of Lincoln's acquires new interest from the revival of controversy about the Mexican War, and the discussion of our present misunderstandings. Lincoln wrote:

I do not quarrel with facts; but your statement excludes some facts material in my judgment to a just conclusion.

He then enumerates the facts which show the groundlessness of the claim of the Polk administration that we had ever been the aggressors.

If you admit that these are facts (he concluded), then I shall be obliged for a reference to any law of language, law of states, law of nations, law of morals, law of religions, any law, human or divine, in which authority can be found for saying those facts constitute "no aggression." Would you venture to consider these acts of no moment had they been committed by any nation on earth against the humblest of our people? I know you would not. Then I ask, is the precept "Whatsoever ye would that men should

do to you, do ye even so unto them," obsolete or of no application?

As to the opposition to the Mexican war coming solely from the anti-slavery people of the North, it needs simply to be said that the opposition of Henry Clay of Kentucky and John C. Calhoun of South Carolina—certainly no "anti-slavery politicians"—was if possible even more pronounced than that of Daniel Webster and Charles Sumner in Massachusetts.

As to the war being provoked by Mexico, General Taylor, who commanded our invading forces, and General Grant, who as a young lieutenant served under him, are certainly competent witnesses. General Grant in his later life declared it "one of the most unjust wars ever waged by a stronger against a weaker people." It was, he said, "a political war; our troops were sent to provoke a fight." Zachary Taylor himself, who as an obedient soldier fought its battles and became its hero, viewed it just as Grant viewed it; and it was largely because men knew this that he was made President of the United States.

My life (he wrote at the close of the war), has been devoted to arms, yet I look upon war at all times and under all circumstances as a national calamity, to be avoided if compatible with the national honor. The principles of our government, as well as its true policy, are opposed to the subjugation of other nations and the dismemberment of other countries by conquest.

Yet the politics of James K. Polk was apologized for and glorified by the Commencement orator at Boston University twenty years ago, on the ground that Texas and California are today prosperous states, better off than they were under Mexico; and The Boston *Herald's* correspondent comes perilously near the same argument. This is really the philosophy of the writer in the New York *World*. It is a very common and a very old philosophy. It was the philosophy of Ahab when he coveted Naboth's vineyard and thought that he could put it to better use. Our Mexican conquests were "necessary to the growth of our nation." It is the philosophy which holds that the world belongs to the fortunate, that these "superior" men and nations have the right of way, and that the "inferior" people have no rights which others are bound to respect. If they happen to be on the track when the Twentieth Century Limited is bearing down with the Pullmans, they must get out of the way or be run over. Had these philosophers been in the Teutoburg Forest, A. D. 9, when Hermann and his Cheruscans were sweeping the Roman legions of Varus off the earth, they would have groaned over the triumph of "barbarians" over civilization. "O Varus, give me back my legions!" cried Augustus at Rome. But New York and London and the men of the Weimar convention today know that in Hermann and his Teutonic "hordes" was the rising hope of the world.

The philosophy of the *World's* correspondent was our philosophy in Texas and Mexico, as it was and is in the Philippines. Admiral Dewey said when he captured the Philippines and got acquainted with the leaders in the revolution there, that they were as capable of self-government as the Cubans whom he knew; but after thirty years of our assiduous nurture, the "superior" folk at Washington now pronounce them quite incapable. Their fate was the subject of painful discussion at a recent luncheon of the Republican Club in New York. One of the speakers, Professor Jenks, said that the United States should still keep control "for the good of the Filipinos." Another speaker, Mr. Switzer, said that we must retain the islands "as a source of tropical raw materials such as rubber." I do not know which is the worse. There was a discussion of the same sort at the Williamstown Institute last summer; and Col. Carmi Thompson's report has at this moment made it anew a matter of practical politics. Do we really believe in government by consent or by satrap?

Boston and Massachusetts knew in 1845 as well as in 1865 what the fields are in which a nation pays the penalties of its sins; and there was the center of the opposition. We do not forget the noble utterances of Giddings and Abraham Lincoln, of Clay and Calhoun; but the great body of the words which ring down through history in condemnation of the Mexican War and the policy that provoked it are Massachusetts words. It is in the writings of Channing and the speeches of John Quincy Adams that the process of the annexation of Texas finds its righteous exposure; and as the iniquitous war with Mexico went on, all that was virtuous and chivalric in the Commonwealth combined to mourn the dishonor and impeach the crime. When we have named Daniel Webster and Charles Francis Adams, Charles Sumner and Henry Wilson, Dana and Hilliard, Palfrey and Horace Mann, Samuel and Rockwood Hoar, Garrison, Phillips, and Theodore Parker, Longfellow, Lowell, Whittier, and Emerson, it is a roll of honor which sufficiently answers the smug contention that criticism must cease in war and that the patriot's doctrine then must be "My country, right or wrong." "The Biglow Papers," the first series which belongs to this period and is a sustained satire upon the Mexican War, is not only the masterpiece of American wit, but one of the immortal masterpieces of political morality.

Massachusetts (said the address adopted at the meeting in 1845 in Faneuil Hall, which Daniel Webster helped prepare), denounces the iniquitous project in its inception and in every stage of its progress, in its means and in its end, and in all the purposes and pretenses of its authors.

In 1847 the Massachusetts legislature adopted by a vote of more than two to one a report on the war, prepared by Charles Sumner, embodying a searching history of the war and its unrighteous provocation; and I think that no verdict ever penned upon the Mexican War, or upon any government which, in the words of General Grant, sends soldiers "to provoke a fight" for political purposes, will better stand the test of the day of judgment. That old report has been published among the Old South Leaflets (No. 132); and I advise any reader who questions the verdict that the Mexican War was "inglorious" to send three red stamps to the Old South Meeting House in Boston, for that report, and see what Charles Sumner thought on the subject.

In February 1926, just eighty years from the time when Taylor in Texas received his orders to march to the Rio Grande, an audience that "occupied every available seat" in the grand ballroom

of the Hotel Astor in New York was gathered at the meeting of the Foreign Policy Association for a discussion of the question, "Is trouble impending with Mexico?"—and some very unpleasant and startling things were said. The program was repeated in Boston; and the discussion has gone on in the country during the year that has followed, as new follies have fled the flames and virtue has begun to bind its tongue. Both nations are members of the Hague Arbitration Court. Why do they not refer their disputes to that tribunal? Why does not our nation which is the stronger of the two, make the proposal—and do it now? Mr. Root, the wisest living statesman, has just told us that the trouble in such crises is usually with the people themselves; they do not speak out when and as they should. Let them speak out now on the Mexican question and say to the Administration at Washington with power that the present rudderless drifting must stop. Let Boston and Massachusetts especially speak in the bold tones of 1846. It is a time to remember the principles which Abraham Lincoln brought to the Mexican question of 1846. It is the time to save ourselves from repetition of the shame with which we now read the story of the Mexican War of eighty years ago.

Boston, Mass. EDWIN D. MEAD.

The Story of My Experiments with Truth

[The Autobiography of Mahatma Gandhi]

(Copyrighted, 1926)

PART II—CHAPTER XIX

Natal Indian Congress

Practice as a lawyer was and remained, for me, a subordinate occupation. It was necessary that I should concentrate on public work to justify my stay in Natal. The despatch of the Petition regarding the Disfranchising Bill was not sufficient in itself. Sustained agitation was essential for making an impression on the Secretary of State for the Colonies. For this purpose it was thought necessary to bring into being a permanent organization. So I consulted with Seth Abdulla and other friends and we all decided to have a public organization of a permanent character.

To arrive at the name to be given to the new organization perplexed me sorely. It was not to identify itself with any particular party. The name 'Congress', I knew, was in bad odour with Conservatives and yet the Congress was the very life of India. I wanted to popularize it in Natal. It savored of cowardice to hesitate to adopt it. Therefore, with full explanation of my reasons, I recommended that the organization should be called the Natal Indian Congress and on the 22nd, May, the Natal Indian Congress came into being.

Dada Abdulla's spacious room was packed to the full on that day. The Congress received the enthusiastic approval of all present. Its constitution was simple, the subscription was heavy. Only he who paid five shillings monthly could be a member. The wealthy classes were persuaded to pay as much as they could. Abdulla Seth headed the list with £ 2 per month. Two other friends also put down the same. I thought I should not stint my subscription and put down a pound per month. This was for me no small amount. But I thought that it would not be beyond my means, if at all I was to pay my way. And God helped me. We thus got a considerable number of members who subscribed £ 1 per month. The number of those who put down 10s. was even larger. Besides this, there were donations which were gratefully accepted.

Experience showed that no one paid his subscription for the mere asking. It was impossible to call frequently on members outside Durban. The enthusiasm of one moment seemed to wear away the next. Even the members in Durban had to be considerably dunned before they would pay in their subscriptions.

The task of collecting subscriptions lay with me, I being the Secretary. And we came to a stage when I had to keep my clerk engaged all day long in the work of collection. The man got tired of the job, and I felt that if the situation was to be improved the subscriptions should be made payable annually and not monthly, and that, too, strictly in advance. So I called a meeting of the Congress. Every one welcomed the proposal for making the subscription annual instead of monthly and for fixing the minimum at £ 3. Thus the work of collection was considerably facilitated.

I had learned at the outset not to carry on public work with borrowed money. One could rely on people's promises in most matters except in respect to money. I had never found people quick to pay the amounts they had undertaken to subscribe and the Natal Indians were no exception to the rule. As therefore no work was done unless there were funds on hand, the Natal Indian Congress has never been in debt.

My co-workers evinced extraordinary enthusiasm in canvassing members. It was work which interested them and was at the same time an invaluable experience. Large numbers of people gladly came forward with cash subscriptions. Work in the distant villages of the interior was rather difficult. People did not know the nature of public work. And yet we had invitations to visit faraway places, leading merchants of every place extending their hospitality.

On one occasion during this tour the situation was rather difficult. We expected our host to contribute £ 6, but he refused to give anything more than £ 3. If we had accepted that amount from him, others would have followed suit and our collections would have been spoiled. It was a late hour of the night and we were all hungry. But how could we eat without having first obtained the

amount we were bent on getting? All persuasions were useless. The host seemed to be adamant. Other merchants in the town reasoned with him, and we all sat up throughout the night, he and we both determined not to budge one inch. Most of my co-workers were burning with rage, but they contained themselves. At last when day was already breaking the host yielded, paid down £ 6 and feasted us. This happened at Tongaat, but the repercussion of the incident was felt as far as Stanger on the North Coast and Charlestown in the interior. It also hastened our work of collection.

But collecting funds was not the only thing to do. In fact I had long learned the principle of never having more money at one's disposal than necessary.

Meetings used to be held once a month or even once a week, if required. Minutes of the proceedings of the preceding meeting would be read and all sorts of things would be discussed. People had no experience in taking part in public discussions or of speaking briefly and to the point. Every one hesitated to stand up to speak. I explained to them the rules of procedure at meetings and they respected them. They realized that it was an education for them and many who had never been accustomed to speaking before an audience soon acquired the habit of thinking and speaking publicly about matters of public interest.

Knowing that in public work minor expenses at times absorbed large amounts, I had decided not to have even the receipt books printed in the beginning. I had a cyclostyle machine in my office on which I took copies of receipts and reports. Such things I began to get printed only when the Congress coffers were full and when the number of members and work had increased. Such economy is essential for every organization, and yet I know that it is not always exercised. That is why I have thought it proper to enter into these little details of the beginnings of a small but growing organization.

People never cared to have receipts for the amounts they paid, but we always insisted on the receipts being given. Every pie was thus clearly accounted for and I dare say the account books for the year 1894 can be found intact even today in the records of the Natal Indian Congress. Carefully kept accounts are a *sine qua non* for any organization. Without them it falls into disrepute. Without properly kept accounts it is impossible to maintain truth in its pristine purity.

Another feature of the Congress was service of Colonial-born educated Indians. The Colonial-born Indian Educational Association was founded under the auspices of the Congress. The members consisted mostly of these educated youths. They had to pay a nominal subscription. The association served to ventilate their needs and grievances, to stimulate thought amongst them, to bring them into touch with Indian merchants and also to afford them scope for service of the community. It was a sort of debating society. The members met regularly, and spoke or read papers on different subjects. A small library was also opened in connection with the association.

The third feature of the Congress was propaganda. This consisted in acquainting the English in South Africa and England and people in India with the real state of things in Natal. With that end in view I wrote two pamphlets. The first was "An Appeal to every Briton in South Africa." It contained a statement, supported by evidence, of the general condition of Natal Indians. The other was entitled "The Indian Franchise—An Appeal." It contained a brief history of the Indian franchise with facts and figures. I had devoted considerable labor and study to the preparation of these pamphlets and the result was quite commensurate with the trouble taken. They were widely circulated.

All this activity resulted in winning the Indians numerous friends in South Africa and in obtaining the active sympathy of all parties in India. It also opened out and placed before the South African Indians a definite line of action.

M. K. GANDHI.

(Translated from Navajivan by Mahadeo Desai.)

Ineligible to Naturalization

In Geneva the capital of the world there is one man whom all delight to honor.

He had large preparation for his life career of wide influence. The best culture that his own land, peculiarly rich in cultural development, could give was his from infancy. Next America, first in the University of Pennsylvania and second in Johns Hopkins—then at the zenith of its ideal early days—shared with him its choicest heritage. Germany followed (and German scholarship never knew a more golden age) in this process of blending the rarest and most distinctive cultural gifts in the training of a large-hearted youth for conspicuous service.

Back in his homeland after all this preparation, positions of administration and instruction in several of the leading educational institutions there were pressed upon him in succession and he rapidly developed into one of those ideal teachers for whom his race for hundreds of years had been renowned. With this service he combined contributions to the literature of science and authorship of work that made him known to the world of scholars. In especial he wrote a little book which interpreted his nation's soul so revealingly to the rest of the world that it went from country to country in new translations and is today *sui generis* in enabling foreigners to know his people.

Meantime his practical sagacity and administrative ability opened to him doors to the highest political opportunity but he refused to be seduced from the domain of those quiet forces which really determine a nation's spiritual development. Though he would not be a Cabinet officer, he held his wisdom and experience at

the service of every public man who desired them. Only those closest to him know how unceasing have been these contributions to the history of his country.

When the League of Nations was founded he was the one person fitted best to head its secretarial force in Geneva and ever since he has occupied the position of Under Secretary General, only the Secretary General Sir Eric Drummond, a Britisher, and the Assistant Secretary General M. Avenole, a Frenchman, being technically his superiors.

In this position honors and responsibilities have come to him in increasing number. Last summer it was perfectly natural that he should be chosen to extend the League's welcome to the 300 students from Britain and the United States who formed the clientele of the Geneva Institute of International Relations. The Far East Relief turned to him as Chieftain at their great international dinner in September. While in his capacity of Director of the Section of Intellectual Co-operation and as such the Secretary General of the International Committee on Intellectual Co-operation, he heads the most unique, far-reaching and promising work which the League of Nations is accomplishing.

Back now this up with the picture of an idyllic home life. Decades ago in Philadelphia this ardent young spirit met a daughter of one of the typical Quaker families of that metropolis of brotherly love, herself a young woman of rare grace and poise of character, fitted as well by social training and formal education for any position. It was not long before there ripened between these two an affection that culminated in marriage. The years have only deepened and sanctified their romance. They set up a world home, open without regard to race or creed, where uncounted numbers of the elect of all countries have shared a hospitality as generous and gracious as it has been inspiring. Those who know these two personalities never think of them apart. They are one in a friendship which has girdled the earth. The value of such a home in the Capital of the World representing the idealistic spirit of their two countries cannot be over-estimated as a great asset to their nations.

One of the great captains of American industry sometime since visited Geneva to learn at first hand the story of the achievements of the League of Nations. When he left he remarked to a friend concerning the subject of this all too inadequate sketch. "Dr. Inazo Nitobe is the best loved man in Geneva." It is this man that the law of the United States as interpreted by our Supreme Court stigmatizes as "ineligible to naturalization."

Does he feel the sting of this characterization? Yes, and more than two years after the last and most unkind cut of all was aimed by Congress at the heart of the Japanese people, the personal pain felt by this man over this insult to his nation is realized with steadily increasing keenness as the months roll on. But Americans not in his confidence would never know it. Dr. and Mrs. Nitobe's home opens as widely and as generously to our people as to those of any government that treats men of Asia as brothers and honored equals.

How long will we Americans continue to close our eyes to the colossal blunder of stigmatizing on our statute books some one-half of the human race as "ineligible to naturalization"? How simple for Congress to pass a bill providing that "All aliens legally domiciled in the United States are equally eligible to naturalization." Religion dictates such brotherly action. In bona-fide world statesmanship it is of the nature of an axiom. Mere regard for our own material interests demands it. The future of American business in Asia is interwoven with it. Our restrictive policy of immigration would not in the slightest be affected by it. Best of all it would guarantee the perennial peace of the Pacific.

Geneva, Switzerland DOREMUS SCUDDER.

Correspondence

Conscription of Wealth

Editor of UNITY:

Let me thank you for your editorial against that dangerous proposal for the so-called conscription of wealth in time of war.

All these bills propose to authorize the conscription not only of wealth but of labor. In case of our having another war, nobody knows who will be President at that time, or who will be the members of the U. S. Supreme Court. Supposing we happened to have a President with the will and the courage to conscript wealth—which is a large supposition—the Supreme Court might very likely decide that it is unconstitutional to conscript wealth, but quite constitutional to conscript labor.

In the past we have found that great wealth has always been able to evade or defy every attempt to take much of it for public purposes, and the measures framed to control it have proved powerless for that purpose, while they have often been wrested to inflict hardship on labor; witness the Sherman Anti-Trust Act.

The plan is favored by some well-meaning persons who hope to "take the profit out of war," and thereby to make war less likely. But the practical dangers would far outweigh the advantages. The war powers of the President and Congress are already very wide. This conscription measure would strip the citizen of the last vestige of his constitutional rights.

ALICE STONE BLACKWELL.

Dorchester, Mass.

A Tribute from a Generous Friend

Editor of UNITY:

I enclose check covering amount of my renewal-subscription to UNITY.

UNITY is to me indispensable. It props "in these bad days my mind." It both guides and reflects my own thinking. I regard it as a sane and stinging corrective of journalistic bourbonism and herd-mindedness, and its valiant rightness stimulates. It is one of the precious few rational voices in a mad world. I hope it will continue to cry aloud and spare not!

Faithfully yours,

MORGAN BARNES.

Double Appreciation

(From a Private Letter)

". . . We appreciate UNITY so much that this house subscribes for two copies.

VIOLET MCNAUGHTON,
Editor, *Western Producer.*

Saskatchewan, Canada.

Editor of UNITY:

My check is enclosed herewith to continue UNITY coming for another year. It fits my state of mind and progress to the last degree and is the best "bracer" I have ever encountered. Sincerely yours,

M. A. BRATTLAND.

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

A CALENDAR OF WORLD HEROES

Prepared by Arthur Charles Watkins; comprising portraits of twelve heroic figures chosen by students from schools in more than thirty countries and the essay on each that won the prize in the competition of 1925-1926, instituted by Clement M. Biddle of New York.

Committee of Award

Augustus O. Thomas, LL.D. Commissioner of Education of the State of Maine and President of the World Federation of Education Associations. *Chairman.*

Richard Bartholdt. Former member of the U. S. Congress and Former President of Interparliamentary Union for Promotion of International Arbitration.

Albert F. Coyle. Editor of the *Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers' Journal.*

James William Crabtree, M.A. Secretary of the National Education Association.

Glenn Frank, LL.D. President of the University of Wisconsin.

David Starr Jordan, Ph.D., LL.D. Chancellor Emeritus of Leland Stanford, Jr., University.

Henry Noble MacCracken, Ph.D., LL.D. President of Vassar College.

Francis John McConnell, D.D., LL.D. Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

Parker Thomas Moon, Ph.D. Professor of Political Science in Columbia University.

John Augustine Ryan, D.D. Professor of Moral Theology and Industrial Ethics in the Catholic University of America.

Mrs. William Tilton. Chairman of the Legislative Committee of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers.

Stephen Samuel Wise, Ph.D., LL.D. Acting President of the Jewish Institute of Religion and Rabbi of the Free Synagogue, New York City.

Published by The World Hero Calendar Department, National Council for Prevention of War, 532 Seventeenth Street, N. W., Washington, D. C., U. S. A.

The Competition

The competition followed the offer by Clement M. Biddle of New York of $1,200 to be awarded to the writers of the twelve best essays on world heroes. It was in no sense intended to be and in no sense was a referendum of high-school students of this country or of students in schools of comparable grade in other countries. Each school that elected to participate in the study project was allowed to choose and send to the Committee of Award a list of twelve names of those the school considered most worthy to be remembered for heroic service to humanity of a permanent character. The school was also allowed to send in an essay on each of the heroes it had chosen.

It is estimated that about a thousand schools and a half-million students took some part in the study, in the selection of names of heroes, and in the essay-writing. After many eliminations because of failure to meet the conditions, 563 schools were registered as eligible to have their school votes counted. Of these schools, 195 were in the United States of America and 368 were in other countries. A total of approximately 6,800 school votes was registered. If it is assumed that the participating schools had an average of 500 students each, then these 6,800 school votes represented a total of approximately 3,400,000 student votes cast by approximately 282,000 students. The 6,800 school votes were cast for 609 different candidates. The twelve names selected were those that received the highest number of votes. In this Calendar the portraits and essays are arranged according to the number of school votes each character received.

The Prize Essays

The essays came from nearly all countries of Europe—England, France, Germany, Austria, Latvia, Estonia, Spain, Italy, Rumania, Bulgaria, Czecho-slovakia, Switzerland, and Greece—as well as from practically every one of the United States, from Canada, Mexico, Porto Rico, Jamaica, the Virgin Islands, Hawaii, the Philippines, Turkey, India, Persia, Morocco, and even from far-off Tasmania.

Of all the essays written on the twelve characters chosen by the vote of the students, the twelve printed in the Calendar are the ones judged to be the best by the Committee of Award composed of internationally known educators, editors, and publicists.

"Although the members of the Committee of Award had no clue to the origin and authorship of the essays," said Doctor Thomas in announcing the results, "it was gratifying to discover that five of the twelve prizes went to students in foreign countries, and that five of the twelve winning essays were written by girls. It is an interesting and really remarkable coincidence that the prize for the best essay on David Livingstone went to a student in the High School for Girls in Pretoria, South Africa. A girl in the Roman Catholic parochial Academy of the Holy Family in Baltic, Connecticut, won the prize for her essay on Joan of Arc. The High School in Burlington, New Jersey, had the extraordinary distinction of winning two of the twelve prizes. A boy in that school received the prize for his essay on Pasteur, and a girl received the prize for her essay on Lincoln."

A Remarkable Collection of Portraits

The twelve portraits selected for this Calendar are probably the most suitable of all the pictures extant and will be a great inspiration in any home or school-room. They were chosen with the expert advice of Mr. David E. Roberts, Division of Prints, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C. The engraving has been executed under the personal direction of Mr. J. Benton Webb, of the Williams-Webb Company, Washington, D. C. The impressive appearance of the printed plates is the result of the skillful treatment they have had at the hands of Mr. Norman T. A. Munder, of Baltimore, Maryland.

As presented in the Calendar, the portraits are all in halftone. The origin and history of each picture is given below.

Louis Pasteur—From an etching by Leopold Flameng (1831-1911) after a painting by Albert Edelfeldt (1854-1905).

Abraham Lincoln—From a wood-engraving by Thomas Johnson (contemporary), after a photograph taken by Alexander Hesler in Springfield, Ill., June, 1860.

Christopher Columbus—From an etching by Henri Emile Lefort (1852—), after an anonymous portrait in the Naval Museum at Madrid, Spain.

George Washington—From a lithograph by Rembrandt Peale (1787-1860.)

Benjamin Franklin—From a photograph of the painting by Joseph Sifrède Duplessis (1725-1802). By courtesy of Norman T. A. Munder & Co., Baltimore, Md.

Woodrow Wilson—From a photograph taken by Harris & Ewing in Washington, D. C., 1912.

Florence Nightingale — From a wood-engraving by Timothy Cole (1852—), after a photograph.

Joan of Arc—From a photograph of the statue by Henri Michel Antoine Chapu (1833-1891) in the Luxembourg Museum. By courtesy of Norman T. A. Munder & Co., Baltimore, Md.

Socrates—From a photograph of the bust in the Louvre in Paris.

Johann Gutenberg—From a photogravure of the painting by Jean Leon Gérome Ferris (1863—). The inset is from an old Mainz copy of the Strassburg portrait.

David Livingstone—From a wood-engraving, after a photograph taken by Thomas Annan, Glasgow, Scotland.

George Stephenson—From a mezzotint engraving by Charles Turner (1773-1857), after a painting by Henry Perronet Briggs (1791-1844).

The Calendar and Its Distribution

The Calendar is composed of a cover page and 12 sheets, 11 by 18 inches, each with the portrait of one of the heroes and the winning essay on that hero. All of these sheets, beautifully printed in black with a border in golden brown, are held together by a stout binding at the top and provided with a cord for suspending the Calendar against the wall.

Although only twelve students could win the essay prizes, thousands of students have helped to make this large educational project a worldwide success. Every school that took part—and perhaps every student—will want to own a copy of the Calendar. All who helped to prepare the Calendar have cooperated to reduce the price so low as to make this valuable work available to every boy and girl, every Church and public school, every library, every home, every office, in America and every other country that participated in the contest.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN CENTRE CHICAGO

Friday Morning Forum

10:30 A. M.

January 28—Henry N. MacCracken

The International Aspects of Education

President, Vassar College.

February 4—Henry Pratt Fairchild

The Domineering Dead

Social Scientist. Director of Bureau of Community Service and Research, New York University. Authority on Immigration.

February 11—J. Malcolm Bird

The Present Status of Spirit Phenomena

Foremost investigator of spirit phenomena. Formerly of the "Scientific American" investigating committee. Author of "Margery."

CONCERNING THE AMERICAN COMMITTEE FOR FAIR PLAY IN CHINA

The American Committee for Fair Play in China was organized in June, 1925, in San Francisco, "to give to America the uncolored truth about China, with the conviction that a proper understanding between nations is the only requisite to just relations and mutually helpful dealing, and that out of this understanding good will come for China and for the world." The first bulletin concerning the Shanghai disaster was published at that time, and distributed to progressive and interested persons throughout the United States. Three other bulletins have since been issued, the second being an explanation of the aims and organization of the Committee, with a resume of the activities in Peking of Elizabeth Green, its representative in China. The third bulletin is a report of the military situation, and the fourth, an analysis of the Student Movement, including a discussion of the Anti-Christian Movement, the Anti-Foreign Movement, etc. Since late summer, the Committee has been mainly engaged in local activities to the same purpose, but its work in this direction is nearly completed and it will resume its usual program. The fifth bulletin will appear soon, and others will follow it.

The plan of the organization is to create through the means of unbiased reports of conditions in the Far East, a fair-minded and intelligent public sentiment which will effect and support a just Foreign Policy in the Orient. It proposed originally to appeal only to the people of this country, but the movement has grown far beyond its original boundaries, being represented by active members and distributors in nearly every European country, as well as in China, Japan, India, South America, Egypt, New Zealand, Canada, Cuba and islands in the Pacific.

This growth has been made possible through the friendly, volunteer help of those interested in the work of the organization, who have contributed their services, their time, and offered financial support as well. There have been no salaried officers from the beginning and there has been practically no overhead expense.

The need for such an organization is evinced by the steady growth of the American Committee for Fair Play in China; the assurance of the sincerity of its purpose and the definite value of its contribution by the character of those who have sponsored it publicly. During the last few months departments in several prominent universities have requested bulletins for use in their courses, among them, Columbia University, Wellesley College, Bryn Mawr College, University of California, Harvard University, and others. It is an independent and non-partisan organization, enabled to operate through voluntary and individual financial support. It does not aim to persuade or proselyte, but to give accurate information.

Bulletins sent on request. Address: 1221 Hearst Bldg., San Francisco, Calif.

JANUARY

Preparations for a trip south, or a continuation of Winter Social Activities at home, suggest that you save expense thru the cleansing of your garments by our new system of continuous clarification.

Schumann & Co
Cleaners Dyers

PHONE DREXEL 6881 ALL DEPARTMENTS
MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3960 Cottage Grove Avenue

It's a "Case" of Necessity

Your Printing will be above criticism if done by

THE OAKLAND PRESS

3913 Cottage Grove
Tel. Atlantic 1876

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. and Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor —large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

For Happy Health!

Drink a glassful of Bowman's Milk. You'll like it, for Bowman's Milk is full cream milk. It is always rich and pure. In it are the elements so necessary for happy health!
Make it a habit to drink a glass of Bowman's Milk at every meal.
Insist on

BOWMAN DAIRY COMPANY MILK

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES

Everything in HARDWARE

AT

PORTER'S

4236 Cottage Grove Ave.